ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY PLAN ACCESS ROAD

APPLICANT:

ALYESKA PIPELINE SERVICE COMPANY 1835 S BRAGAW STREET ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99512

RIGHT-OF-WAY APPLICATION FF088246 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. BPM 92-011

PREPARED BY:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
ALASKA STATE OFFICE
BRANCH OF PIPELINE MONITORING
411 W. 4th AVENUE, SUITE 2B
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

May 15, 1992

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, ALASKA BRANCH OF PIPELINE MONITORING (983)

I. NEPA REQUIREMENTS

Introduction

Alyeska Pipeline Service Company (Alyeska) has requested authorization to reopen, resurface, extend, or construct 27 pipeline access roads as part of the Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP), approved by Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the State of Alaska on April 3, 1991. The roadwork will be authorized by right-of-way grants under the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act, 97 Stat. 584 (1973). This assessment addresses 1 of the access roads which will involve new construction. The site was field examined in August, 1991.

Issues

BLM staff members have raised the following issues and concerns: (1) potential impacts to cultural resources, (2) potential impacts from hazardous and solid wastes, (3) potential impacts to visual resources, (4) potential impacts to subsistence resources, and unnecessary or duplicative road development.

(C) <u>Relationship to Statutes</u>, <u>Regulations</u>, <u>Policies</u>, <u>Plans or other</u> <u>Environmental Analyses</u>

The statute that applies to this proposed action is the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act. Alyeska holds a Federal right-of-way grant for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS). The project area is located within the inner Utility Corridor on lands managed by BLM. The relevant planning document is the Utility Corridor Resource Management Plan (RMP) approved on January 11. 1991. The proposed action is in conformance with the land use plan as required by 43 CFR 1610.5.

The proposed action is a requirement of Alyeska's Oil Spill Contingency Plan for the TAPS, Stipulation 2.14 of the Agreement and Grant of Right-of-Way for TAPS, and the National Oil Hazardous Pollution Contingency Plan 36 FR 16215, August 20, 1971.

Four (4) environmental impact statements have been completed for three separate pipeline projects and for the BLM RMP, each of which cover the application area. Information describing the existing environment is available in these documents.

II. PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

Purpose and Need for Action

The proposed action is needed to provide surface access roads as part of the

requirements of Alyeska's OSCP. This plan consists of General Provisions and 12 Section Plans which delineate specific response actions for spills located between pump stations. Contingency Area Plans, mapped and described in each Section Plan, give response actions for pipeline spill within specific drainages. Containment sites were selected within the 12 Contingency Areas to enable rapid response to oil spills thereby minimizing the amount of oil that could reach sensitive areas. Most of these preplanned sites have been located on small drainages and points of confluence. Permanent vehicle access is needed at the site served by the access road in this permit action.

Proposed Action

The proposed action is construction of a pipeline access road to provide access to a waterway served by the a site. An former pipeline access road will be reopened for primary access between the Dalton Highway and the pipeline right-of-way. 99 APL -0 (OSCP Site 63) is located in Section 23, T. 29 N., R. 12 W., F.M. It will not be open to public access.

No Action Alternative

The no action alternative would be denying Alyeska's request to utilize the public lands. If the proposed action can be mitigated through standard operating procedures, denying of a permit (no action alternative) would be inconsistent with Bureau policy formulated in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) (43 USC 1701). FLPMA directs the Secretary of the Interior to manage the public lands on the basis of multiple use and sustained yield.

Not having access to preconstructed containment sites next to the waterways may result in extensive environmental damage should an oil spill occur, as response time would be longer. Upgraded access may make the difference of whether or not an oil spill is contained.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

(A) Introduction

The affected environment for the area of the proposed action is adequately discussed in the following documents: Utility Corridor Resource Management Plan, Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Utility Corridor, Alyeska's Oil Spill Contingency Plan, Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Trans-Alaska Gas System.

(B) The following critical elements of the human environment are subject to requirements specified in statue, regulation or Executive Order. These critical elements have been analyzed for the proposed action and no significant impacts are likely to occur:

| Critical Elements | | May Be <u>Impacted</u> | Can be <u>Mitigated</u> |
|-------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. | Air Quality | No | |
| 2. | ACEC's | No | |
| 3. | Cultural and Historic | No | |
| 4. | Farmland, Prime or Unique | No | |
| 5. | Floodplains | No | |
| 6. | Nat. Amer. Rel Concerns | No | |
| 7. | Paleontological | No | |
| 8. | Threatened/Endangered | No | |
| 9. | Visual Resources | Yes | Yes |
| 10. | Waste, Hazardous/Solid | No | |
| 11. | Water Quality | No | |
| 12. | Wetlands/Riparian Zones | No | |
| 13. | Wild & Scenic Rivers | No | |
| 14. | Wilderness Values | No | |

No ACECs are affected.

No known cultural resource sites are located in the immediate project area. Road construction will required overlay of materials after leveling and removal of vegetative matter. No excavation is planned.

Work on the floodplain of the river will consist of grading of the existing surface as necessary. It is not expected that the limited blade work will impact resources.

There is no reasonably foreseeable restriction to subsistence activity or effect on the availability or productivity of resources for subsistence use which will result from the proposed action. Substantial benefits to subsistence resources would occur if the sites were successful in the rapid containment of spilled oil.

No refueling or storing of hazardous materials would occur on site.

The proposed action is confined within the area designated as the utility corridor. No wilderness values would be affected by the proposed action.

Road related impacts are further discussed in the Environmental Impact Statement for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. This includes visual resources.

<u>Mitigation</u>

- 1. Prior to commencement of surface disturbing activities, the right-of-way limits, as well as the construction zone limits, shall be staked.
- 2. The finished width of the road surface shall not exceed 28 feet
- 3. Sign and gate access roads as consistent with existing facilities. Remove any existing signs at or near access roads which conflict with public access to public lands in the vicinity of the access point or pipeline.

RESIDUAL IMPACTS

No long term residual impacts are expected to occur.

IV. CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

Persons and Agencies Consulted.

Stan Bronczyk, BLM BPM (983) Arctic District Specialists, BLM Ken Hunt, BLM BPM (983)

V. ANILCA REQUIREMENTS

Section 810 Subsistence Evaluation

This action is not likely to cause any significant restriction to the subsistence resources of the area.

VI. LOCATION REFERENCES

Preliminary design drawing, Access Roads Prudhoe Bay to Valdez Terminal, Alyeska Pipeline Service Company, 1/92.

G-100 series, Trans-Alaska Pipeline System, Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, sheet 42, as revised.

Preparer:

Date: 5/15/92

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT AND DECISION RECORD

<u>Decision</u>: It is my decision to grant a right-of-way to authorize construction of an access road as part of the Oil Spill Contingency Plan. Individual site requirements, including mitigation if necessary, will be incorporated into the Notices to Proceed written for each action. These actions are authorized pursuant to the Pipeline Authorization Act, 87 Stat. 584 (1973). A rental fee based upon fair market value appraisal will be collected for the rights-of-way.

I have selected the proposed action as the environmentally preferred alternative provided with the mitigation measures identified in this environmental assessment.

Finding of No Significant Impact: Based upon the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached environmental assessment, I have determined that the impacts on the human environment are not expected to be significant and that an environmental impact statement is not required.

The evaluation and finding done to comply with Section 810 of ANILCA found no significant restrictions to subsistence use.

Rationale for the Decision: The decision to allow this proposed action does not result in undue or unnecessary environmental degradation, will not restrict subsistence activity or resources, and is consistent with PLO 5150 which has withdrawn the area for use as a utility corridor. Additionally, the proposed action is necessary to complete the requirements of Oil Spill Contingency Plan.

Chief, Branch of Pipeline Monitoring

5/15/92





